



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Allen Butler, Cephas Brainerd and Walter S. Logan of the New York Bar, and George S. Hale and E. L. Pierce of the Boston Bar. Educational interests were represented by Hon. John Eaton, ex-U. S. Commissioner of Education, President Warfield of Lafayette, Prof. J. B. Clark of Columbia, Charles R. Skinner, State Supt. of Public Instruction of New York, etc. Of distinguished ministers there were Edward Everett Hale, Lyman Abbott, Bishop Foss, Dr. MacArthur, Dr. Reuben Thomas, Dr. Charles L. Thompson, Dr. Bradford, etc. There were several representatives of the newspaper and periodical press: Robert U. Johnson of the *Century Magazine*, Edwin D. Mead of the *New England Magazine*, Dr. Halleck and Mr. Bright of the *Christian Work*, Mr. Foxcroft of the *Boston Journal*, etc. Besides these there were a number of eminent publicists, philanthropists and business men. The most interesting figure in the Conference was Mr. Hodgson Pratt, President of the International Arbitration and Peace Association of London, who has given the last fifteen years of his life largely to the cause of arbitration and peace and has been so influential in the organization and development of the movement on the continent of Europe. Mr. Pratt, because of his intense interest in the promotion of greater concord between the English-speaking nations, came all the way from Lausanne, Switzerland, to attend the Conference. He was heartily welcomed and listened to with the greatest respect whenever he spoke.

Ex-Senator Edmunds, against his own strongly expressed wish, was chosen chairman of the Conference. By his intelligence and dignity as a presiding officer and by his extended knowledge of history and constitutional law he added much to the interest and success of the Conference. When he had to leave at the end of the second day, Robert Treat Paine, President of the American Peace Society, was called to the chair and presided admirably during the rest of the Conference.

The Business Committee, who had charge of the arrangement of the program and the drafting of the declaration of the Conference, consisted of Dr. Lyman Abbott, chairman, Samuel B. Capen, John B. Garrett, Robert U. Johnson, Robert Treat Paine, Judge Stiness and Benjamin F. Trueblood.

The papers, the addresses, and the short speeches made during the discussions were nearly all of a high order. It is rare to hear better speaking, or more intelligent discussion. There was real earnestness in the Conference at all the sessions, amounting at times to genuine enthusiasm, but it was an intelligent and wisely directed earnestness.

The main subject to which the Conference gave its thought was that of a permanent international tribunal for the adjustment of differences between nations. There was a wide divergence of views as to details, and the subject was approached from many different standpoints.

Nearly all conceivable objections were considered, some of them being set up merely to give an opportunity for knocking them down. Some of the speakers wanted a court always sitting with power to enforce its decrees. Others preferred a court of conciliation pure and simple. But there was substantial agreement that a permanent tribunal is both desirable and practicable, and that its decisions would be carried out through the power of public opinion. As to the number of nations at first to be included in the scheme, the general feeling was that a beginning should be made with the United States and Great Britain, and the United States and France. If these great powers should unite in such an arrangement they would become centres of attraction for a number of small powers which would soon come in.

One of the things which impressed us most about the Mohonk Conference was the evidence which it gave of the rapid development of public opinion in favor of the adjustment of all international disputes by rational peaceful methods. The same impression was given by the recent conference at Washington and by the earlier one at Philadelphia. Such conferences would have been impossible even twelve months ago. In saying this, we do not underestimate in any way the many courageous and often thankless efforts put forth during the last eighty years in behalf of the cause. On the contrary, the present apparently sudden development has its roots deep in this difficult and by many unknown past. But every great movement reaches ultimately a stage when it seems to go of itself, when everybody is its friend, when even its best supporters have difficulty in keeping abreast of it. On this stage it seems to us clear that the peace movement is about to enter, if it has not already entered, at least so far as it is related to a few nations which lead the march of civilization.

DECLARATION OF THE MOHONK CONFERENCE.

"In the settlement of personal controversies civilization has substituted the appeal to law for the appeal to force. It is high time for a like substitution of law for war in the settlement of controversies between nations. Law establishes justice, war simply demonstrates power. Such a substitution of law for war requires a permanent tribunal to which all nations may appeal. Its personnel may change, but its judicial life should be continuous; its mere existence would often prevent controversy, and its decisions would become a recognized interpretation of international law. It would not impair the sovereignty, lessen the dignity, nor hazard the honor or safety of any nation. The enforcement of its judgments might be safely left to the moral obligations of the nations concerned, and the moral sentiments of mankind. Such tribunal should be so constituted that all civilized nations may, if they choose, by adhering to the treaty

constituting it, avail themselves of its benefits. Disarmament of the nations should follow such recognition of any provision for the reign of reason over the passions of mankind. The facts that during the past year the Interparliamentary Peace Union, containing Parliamentary representatives from fourteen European Powers, has formulated a plan for an international tribunal; that France has officially proposed to this country a permanent treaty of arbitration, and that it is semi-officially reported that negotiations are pending between the United States and Great Britain for a similar treaty, justify the belief that the way is now open to create between this country and Great Britain, and between this country and France, and perhaps with other Powers also, some permanent system of judicial arbitration as the essential safeguard of civilization.

"We assure President Cleveland that a great majority of his countrymen will hail the consummation of such a treaty as the auspicious harbinger of welfare to the world, assuring peace among leading nations, security and expansion to industry and commerce, steadier employment at more remunerative wages to workingmen, more exalted civilization, a condition of the world in accord with the enlightened conscience of man and the loving will of God. We earnestly call upon statesmen, ministers of every faith, the newspaper and periodical press, colleges and schools, chambers of commerce and boards of trade, organizations of workingmen, and upon all good men and women to exert their influence in favor of this movement, both in making known to the President their desire for a permanent tribunal and in helping to create a larger public sentiment against war, which shall be an efficient and constant support of the new judicial system thus to be founded."

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

The platform adopted by the Republicans in their recent convention at St. Louis, excellent as it is in many respects, does not concern directly the purposes for which this paper is published, except so far as it relates to the foreign policy of the United States and the method of settling disputes internal or external. Those sections of the platform concerning our foreign relations seem to us, on the whole, both by what they say and by what they omit to say, to cater to the jingoistic elements of our population in a manner unworthy of our time, unworthy of a great party, and certain to be displeasing to many of the best and most intelligent men in the Republican ranks.

Here are the sections in full:

Our foreign policy should be at all times firm, vigorous and dignified, and all our interests in the western hemisphere carefully watched and guarded. The Hawaiian Islands should be controlled by the United States, and no foreign power should be permitted to interfere with them;

the Nicaragua canal should be built, owned and operated by the United States; and by the purchase of the Danish Islands we should secure a proper and much needed naval station in the West Indies.

The massacres in Armenia have aroused the deep sympathy and just indignation of the American people and we believe that the United States should exercise all the influence it can properly exert to bring these atrocities to an end.

In Turkey American residents have been exposed to the gravest dangers and American property destroyed there, and everywhere American citizens and American property must be absolutely protected at all hazards and at any cost.

We reassert the Monroe doctrine in its full extent, and we reaffirm the right of the United States to give the doctrine effect by responding to the appeals of any American State for friendly intervention in case of European encroachment. We have not interfered, and shall not interfere, with the existing possessions of any European power in this hemisphere, but those possessions must not, on any pretext, be extended.

We hopefully look forward to the eventual withdrawal of the European powers from this hemisphere, to the ultimate union of all of the English-speaking parts of the continent by the free consent of its inhabitants.

From the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other American peoples to free themselves from European domination. We watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the Cuban patriots against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty.

The government of Spain, having lost control of Cuba, and being unable to protect the property or lives of resident American citizens, or to comply with its treaty obligations, we believe that the government of the United States should actively use its influence and good offices to restore peace and give independence to the island.

The peace and security of the republic and maintenance of its rightful influence among the nations of the earth, demand a naval power commensurate with its position and responsibility. We, therefore, favor the continued enlargement of the navy and a complete system of harbor and sea-coast defences.

We favor the creation of a national board of arbitration to settle and adjust differences which may arise between employers and employed engaged in interstate commerce.

As to the first section, "all our interests in the Western hemisphere" are not in the least conceivable danger at the present time, from any nation whatever, nor have they been for a long time. There was no occasion whatever to conjure up the ghost of dread in this respect, and to attempt to fortify people's confidence by an appeal to a "vigorous," foreign policy. It does not take a very fine sense to scent the Anglophobia which dictated this sentence, an appeal to which was thought necessary to catch votes.

Hawaii should *not* be controlled by the United States, nor by any other power, but should be allowed freely to control its own destinies, as every people has an inalienable right to do. There is quite as much to be said